

AGENDA ITEM VI A

REPORTS OF THE ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER

**RESULTS OF THE MAY 2005 MEETING OF THE STATEWIDE
COUNCIL OF CHIEF ACADEMIC OFFICERS (SCCAO)**

AGENDA ITEM VI A

REPORTS OF THE ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER

RESULTS OF THE MAY 2005 MEETING OF THE STATEWIDE COUNCIL OF CHIEF ACADEMIC OFFICERS (SCCAO)

STAFF COMMENT

The Statewide Council of Chief Academic Officers (SCCAO) held its third and last meeting of AY 2004-2005 on May 26, 2005. Appended is a copy of the draft minutes from this meeting.

Of particular importance at this meeting was the approval of revisions to two existing guidelines/policies and one new policy. These actions follow as separate agenda items.

APPENDIX

MINUTES

STATEWIDE COUNCIL OF CHIEF ACADEMIC OFFICERS (SCCAO)

Thursday, May 26, 2005

The Statewide Council of Chief Academic Officers (SCCAO) met on Thursday, May 26, 2005, in the Board of Regents Conference Room at 1201 N. Third Street, Claiborne Building, Baton Rouge, Louisiana. The meeting agenda and a list of attendees are appended to these minutes. (*See Appendices I and II.*) Mr. Gerard Killebrew, Associate Commissioner for Academic Affairs, called the meeting to order at 10:45 a.m. Video connections were verified, and members introduced themselves.

I. Approval of Draft Minutes for the February 24, 2005 Meeting

Without objection, the Committee approved draft minutes of the February 24, 2005 meeting, as distributed.

I. Reports of Academic Policy Subcommittees

A. Revisions to Mandatory Guidelines for the Conduct of Off-Campus Activities

Dr. Ken Rea, chairman of the subcommittee charged with this assignment, reviewed second-round subcommittee recommendations for revisions. Dr. Rea went through each section of the revised Guidelines, stopping as necessary to allow for discussion. One item was considered at length: Dr. Rea noted that the subcommittee had voted to maintain service-area requirements for all degree levels; he recommended to the Council that exceptions be made for graduate-level teacher education programs. This motion was considered by the whole Council and rejected on a split vote.

Upon conclusion of all discussion on this agenda item, the Committee voted to approve the revised Guidelines, with corrections, and refer it to the Board of Regents for

consideration.

B. Development of Uniform Policies for the Enrollment of Students Across Multiple Institutions

Mr. Gerard Killebrew reviewed second-round recommendations for changes; all were approved by the Committee. The Committee voted unanimously to send the new policy to the Board of Regents for consideration. Remaining financial concerns shall be addressed once the issue of supplementary funding has been resolved.

C. Inclusion of Transfer Students Into the Computation of the Degree-Awarding Institution's Graduation Rate

Mr. Killebrew noted that due to a lack of an appointed subcommittee to study this issue, no progress has been made on this item since the February 2005 meeting. Dr. Stuart Mills agreed to research whether procedures exist elsewhere that allow for such a count and whether or not such a count would be a relevant statistic. He will report his findings to the Committee at a later date.

D. Implementation of Admission Placement Policy - Mechanisms to Address Remediation Requirements

Mrs. Theresa Hay introduced two concerns under this agenda item.

First, after consulting with the Education Testing Service, the staff was ready to recommend inclusion of specific numerical score equivalencies on appropriate sections of the COMPASS and ASSET assessment tests that equate to existing ACT/SAT numerical scores in

Academic Affairs Policy 2.18 - Minimum Requirements for Entrance into Entry-Level, College-

Level Mathematics and English. The Committee unanimously agreed to these additions, the elimination of references to the ACCUPLACER test, and a few minor editorial changes.

Second, Mrs. Hay reminded colleges and universities that the Regents strongly intend for

institutions to assess the possible transfer of earned student coursework from a state college/university (accredited or non-accredited) even if the course is not included on a state articulation matrix. It remains the institution's sole decision as to whether such credits may be used to fulfill particular degree requirements.

III. New Issues

A. Approval of Articulation Matrices for AY 2005-2006: General Education and Business

Dr. Larry Tremblay distributed proposed articulation matrices in General Education and Business for AY 2005-2006. These were briefly reviewed and then unanimously approved by the Committee. Dr. Tremblay indicated that additional subject area matrices were still under review and would be forthcoming in the future. Dr. Tremblay also cautioned that there remains some confusion on campuses regarding the acceptability of courses on the matrices due to lack of internal communication and information. He encouraged academic officers to freely distribute and discuss these matrices with all affected personnel on their respective campuses.

B. Progress Reports for Conditionally Approved Programs

Mr. Killebrew referred chief academic officers to a list of overdue progress reports for conditionally approved programs and urged all to respond immediately, as appropriate.

C. ACHIEVE - American Diploma Project

In the absence of Dr. Jimmy Clarke, Mr. Killebrew briefly described ACHIEVE - The American Diploma Project, which is an initiative of the Lumina Foundation to coordinate academic expectations and achievements of secondary education with those of post-secondary

education. Louisiana is one of five states chosen to participate in this venture. Dr. Clarke will oversee state efforts.

IV. Updates

A. Transfer Issues (see II. D. Above)

B. LPN Review

Dr. Killebrew noted that on-site campus review visits to LPN programs statewide will continue through June. Thereafter, regional review reports will be received, sent to the affected campuses/college/system for responses, and become the basis for work of a statewide review committee anticipated for Fall 2005.

C. Northshore Steering Committee

Mr. Killebrew briefly commented on the progress of the Northshore Steering Committee since the last SCCAO meeting. The Academic Affairs Subcommittee is currently involved in designing a list of program priorities which will guide discussions of other subcommittees.

D. Jefferson West Learning Committee

Mr. Killebrew note that the Regents recently received the report of an in-state review committee that examined operations of the Jefferson West Learning Center. The Regents agreed with the report's conclusion that an intensive external assessment of post-secondary education needs of the region was necessary before proceeding further. This should occur sometime during AY 2005-2006.

V. Institutional Updates

Institutional representatives informed all present of academic initiatives on their campuses.

VI. Adjournment

There being no further business to come before the Council, Mr. Killebrew declared the

meeting adjourned at 12:35 p.m.

APPENDIX I

Agenda

**Statewide Council of Chief Academic Officers
May 26, 2005 - 10:00 a.m. or
Upon Adjournment of Board of Regents Meeting
1201 N. Third St., Claiborne Building
Board of Regents Conference Room, Sixth Floor
Baton Rouge, LA**

- I. Call to Order**
- II. Introduction of Attendees**
- III. Approval of February, 2005 Minutes**
- IV. Reports of Academic Policy Subcommittees**
 - A. Revisions to Mandatory Guidelines for the Conduct of Off-Campus Activities - Ken Rea**
 - B. Development of Uniform Dual Enrollment Policy - Gerard Killebrew**
 - C. Inclusion of Transfer Students Into the Computation of the Degree-Awarding Institution's Graduation Rate - Stuart Mills**
 - D. Implementation of Admission Placement Policy - Mechanisms to Address Remediation Requirements - Theresa Hay**
- V. New Issues**
 - A. Approval of Articulation Matrices for AY 2005-2006 - Larry Tremblay**
 - 1. General Education**
 - 2. Business**

B. Progress Reports for Conditionally Approved Programs - Gerard Killebrew

C. ACHIEVE - American Diploma Project - Jimmy Clarke

VI. Updates

A. Transfer Issues - Theresa Hay and Larry Tremblay

B. LPN Review - Gerard Killebrew

C. Northshore Steering Committee - Jimmy Clarke

D. Jefferson West Learning Center - Jimmy Clarke

E. Other

VII. Institutional Reports

VIII. Next Meeting

IX. Adjournment

APPENDIX II

LIST OF ATTENDEES

<u>NAME</u>	<u>INSTITUTION</u>
Gerard Killebrew	Regents
Larry Tremblay	Regents
Theresa Hay	Regents
Anthony Monta	Regents
Mary Lou Potter	Regents
Bessie Mitchell	Regents
Theresa Summers	LSU System
Tom Armstrong	LSU-A
Frank Cartledge	LSU A&M
Stephen Guempel	LSU-E
Stuart Mills	LSU-S
Dennis McSeveney	UNO
Michael Ralph	SU System
John Tolliver	SU-BR
Charles Williams	SU-NO
Loren Blanchard	U of L System
Nettie Daniels	Grambling
Ken Rea	La Tech
Jeanne Daboval	McNeese
Carroll Falcon	Nicholls
Stephen Richters	ULM
Thomas Hanson	Northwestern
John Crain	SLU
Steve Landry	ULL
Jerry Pinsel	LCTC System
Stan Wilkins	BPCC
Bradley Ebersole	BRCC
Jeff Smith	Delgado
Brian Keating	Nunez
Bill Martin	River Parishes CC
Bill Tulak	Fletcher TCC
Clarence Hughes	Sowela TCC

AGENDA ITEM VI A 1

REPORTS OF THE ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER

**RESULTS OF THE MAY 2005 MEETING OF THE STATEWIDE
COUNCIL OF CHIEF ACADEMIC OFFICERS (SCCAO)**

**REVISED MANDATORY GUIDELINES FOR THE CONDUCT OF OFF-
CAMPUS ACTIVITIES**

AGENDA ITEM VI A 1

REPORTS OF THE ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER

RESULTS OF THE MAY 2005 MEETING OF THE STATEWIDE COUNCIL OF CHIEF ACADEMIC OFFICERS (SCCAO)

REVISED MANDATORY GUIDELINES FOR THE CONDUCT OF OFF- CAMPUS ACTIVITIES

STAFF COMMENT

The staff is still working with the Council to finalize editorial changes to the revised Guidelines. A final copy will be made available for Committee consideration at the time of the meeting.

The staff observes that the proposed revisions largely consist of updating the policy to reflect new governance and technologies. A move to eliminate services areas, especially for graduate-level programs in teacher education, was debated within the Council, but the majority decided that this restriction was still needed to preserve college/university scope and mission.

AGENDA ITEM VI A 2

REPORTS OF THE ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER

**RESULTS OF THE MAY 2005 MEETING OF THE STATEWIDE
COUNCIL OF CHIEF ACADEMIC OFFICERS (SCCAO)**

**REVISED ACADEMIC AFFAIRS POLICY 2.18 - MINIMUM
REQUIREMENTS FOR PLACEMENT INTO ENTRY-LEVEL,
COLLEGE-LEVEL MATHEMATICS AND ENGLISH**

AGENDA ITEM VI A 2

REPORTS OF THE ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER

RESULTS OF THE MAY 2005 MEETING OF THE STATEWIDE COUNCIL OF CHIEF ACADEMIC OFFICERS (SCCAO)

REVISED ACADEMIC AFFAIRS POLICY 2.18 - MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS FOR PLACEMENT INTO ENTRY-LEVEL, COLLEGE-LEVEL MATHEMATICS AND ENGLISH

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Upon recommendation of the SCCAO, the Board of Regents adopted Academic Affairs Policy 2.18 - Minimum Requirements for Entrance into Entry-Level, College-Level Mathematics and English in December 2003. This policy clearly established minimum numerical levels for appropriate portions of the ACT and SAT assessment tests that would qualify students to take entry-level, college-level mathematics and English, but only mandated equivalencies (without specific numerical levels) for other commonly used assessment tests such as COMPASS, ASSET, and ACCUPLACER.

STAFF SUMMARY

Since policy approval, there has been some confusion regarding what scores on appropriate sections of the COMPASS and ASSET tests that would fulfill the mandate of Academic Affairs Policy 2.18 for "equivalencies." Further, there appeared little institutional interest in or usage of the ACCUPLACER test. Accordingly, the staff contacted the Educational Testing Service (the testing agency which designed COMPASS and ASSET) to provide specific numerical levels of each which equate to the already accepted ACT/SAT scores. These additional numbers were then incorporated into the policy, reference to ACCUPLACER eliminated, and needed editorial changes made to a revised edition of Academic Affairs Policy 2.18. This revised edition was considered by the SCCAO at its May, 2005 meeting and approved unanimously.

The staff now requests Committee/Board concurrence for this new, draft edition of Academic Affairs Policy 2.18. (See Appendix - added sections in *italics* and removed sections in ~~strikeout~~.)

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The staff recommends that the Academic and Student Affairs Committee grant approval for Revised Academic Affairs Policy 2.18 - Minimum Requirements for Entrance into Entry-Level, College-Level Mathematics and English.

APPENDIX

Academic Affairs Policy 2.18

Minimum Requirements for Placement Into Entry-Level, College-Level Mathematics and English

A. Purpose

This policy is designed to:

1. Establish clear and consistent goals for the level of academic achievement expected of high school students in two subject areas fundamental to success in college;
2. Encourage high school students to improve their academic preparation for college;
3. Increase the retention and graduation rates of students;
4. Bolster the quality and coherence of academic degrees;
5. Provide greater similarity of educational experience across a variety of institutions; and
6. Facilitate the transfer of academic credit between institutions.

B. Effective Date and Scope

Effective Fall 2005, requirements of this policy establish uniform standards and procedures for the placement of students in entry-level, college-level courses in Mathematics and English that can be applied toward the following academic undergraduate degrees: Certificate of Applied Science (CAS), Associate of Applied Science (AAS), Associate of Arts (AA), Associate of Science (AS), Associate (A), Bachelor of Applied Science (BAS), Bachelor of Arts (BA), Bachelor of Science (BS), and Bachelor (B).*

C. General Consideration

A college or university may not establish minimum scores for entry-level, college-level Mathematics or English courses that are higher or lower than those set forth below; however, an institution may require further assessment of students who already meet required minimums to determine their final placement in entry-level, college-level courses in Mathematics and English.

D. Requirements for Placement into Entry-Level, College-Level Mathematics

1. To enroll in an entry-level, college-level Mathematics course designed to fulfill general education requirements of undergraduate academic degrees (listed in B. above), a student must attain a minimum score of either:
 - a. 18 on the Mathematics section of the American College Test (ACT); or
 - b. 430-450 on the Quantitative portion of the College Board's Scholastic Assessment Test (SAT-1); or
 - c. *44 on the Pre-Algebra section of the COMPASS Mathematics Test; or*
 - d. *41 on the Pre-Algebra section of the ASSET Mathematics Test.*
 - e. ~~an appropriate equivalent score on another nationally recognized assessment exam (ASSET, COMPASS, ACCUPLACER, etc.).~~
- ~~2. In the case of c. (above), responsibility for the validation and verification of appropriate score equivalencies, and the setting of a minimum required equivalent score, shall rest with the college or university.~~
- ~~2. 3. In lieu of either 1. or 2. (above), the above, a college or university may institute its own alternate placement system, but such a system must be validated. A valid placement system is governed by the principle that students shall meet, at a minimum, the same level of academic achievement as would have been defined by equivalent scores on the ACT and SAT-1. The validity of an alternate placement system shall be determined by the Board of Regents Division of Academic & Student Affairs.~~

E. Requirements for Placement into Entry-Level, College-Level English

1. To enroll in an entry-level, college-level English course designed to fulfill general education requirements of undergraduate academic degrees (listed in B. above), a student must attain a minimum score of either:
 - a. 18 on the English section of the American College Test (ACT); or
 - b. 50 on the Verbal portion of the College Board's Scholastic Assessment Test (SAT-1); or
 - c. *68 on the COMPASS Writing Test; or*
 - d. *44 on the ASSET Writing Skills Test.*
 - e. ~~an appropriate equivalent score on another nationally recognized assessment exam (ASSET, COMPASS, ACCUPLACER, etc.).~~

2. ~~In the case of c. (above), responsibility for the validation and verification of appropriate score equivalencies, and the setting of a minimum required equivalent score, shall rest with the college or university.~~

2.3. In lieu of ~~either 1. or 2. (above)~~, *the above* a college or university may institute its own alternate placement system, but such a system must be validated. A valid placement system is governed by the principle that students shall meet, at a minimum, the same level of academic achievement as would have been defined by equivalent scores on the ACT and SAT-1. The validity of an alternate placement system shall be determined by the Board of Regents Division of Academic & Student Affairs.

* The effective date for implementation of this policy for those institutions affected by mandates of the 1994 Desegregation Settlement Agreement shall be upon expiration of the term of the Settlement Agreement (i.e., January 1, 2006).

DRAFT

AGENDA ITEM VI A 3

REPORTS OF THE ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER

**RESULTS OF THE MAY 2005 MEETING OF THE STATEWIDE
COUNCIL OF CHIEF ACADEMIC OFFICERS (SCCAO)**

**NEW ACADEMIC AFFAIRS POLICY 2.19 - RESPONSIBILITIES FOR
THE ENROLLMENT OF STUDENTS ACROSS MULTIPLE
INSTITUTIONS**

AGENDA ITEM VI A 2

REPORTS OF THE ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER

RESULTS OF THE MAY 2005 MEETING OF THE STATEWIDE COUNCIL OF CHIEF ACADEMIC OFFICERS (SCCAO)

NEW ACADEMIC AFFAIRS POLICY 2.19 - REQUIREMENTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES FOR THE ENROLLMENT OF STUDENTS ACROSS MULTIPLE INSTITUTIONS

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

November 10, 2004 - Dr. E. Joseph Savoie, Commissioner of Higher Education, addressed the Statewide Council of Chief Academic Officers (SCCAO) to discuss a variety of statewide issues. One issue, in particular, was highlighted by Dr. Savoie in his presentation—the need for a comprehensive statewide policy that set standards for multi-institutional cross/dual student enrollment agreements. Dr. Savoie expressed his strong belief that a policy of this type would:

- (1) be instrumental in further promoting the ready articulation/transfer of courses/programs between and among varied educational institutions; and
- (2) help address the needs of increasingly mobile students who enroll at multiple institutions simultaneously to accomplish their educational goals.

The Council responded to Dr. Savoie's suggestion by immediately forming a special subcommittee charged with the consideration and development of a draft policy.

Chair: John Crain, Provost, Southeastern Louisiana University
Members: Steve Guempel, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, LSU-Eunice
Charles Williams, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Southern
University- New Orleans
Margaret Montgomery-Richard, Chancellor, Louisiana Technical

College

Staff: Gerard Killebrew, Associate Commissioner for Academic Affairs

December 2004 -February 2005 - In December 2004, Dr. Crain circulated among subcommittee members his initial thoughts regarding the proposed policies. After subcommittee/staff consultation, Dr. Crain refined his work further. Meanwhile, Mr. Killebrew met with Dr. Savoie to discuss generally what the Subcommittee perceived as the most formidable impediment toward full implementation of any such policy—the need for more state funding. Dr. Savoie responded by suggesting that the Subcommittee and Council decide on a draft policy exclusive of financial concerns. These concerns would have to be addressed thereafter via discussions with and between the Governor's Office, the Legislature,

the higher education management boards, the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education, and the State Department of Education.

Accordingly, the subcommittee met on February 11, 2005, to discuss all other pending matters related to the projected policy, exclusive of funding issues. This discussion was guided in large by considerations identified in a report of the U.S. Department of Education titled State Enrollment Policies: Addressing Access and Quality. Using the USDoE report, the subcommittee agreed in principle on necessary definitions and requirements. The subcommittee chair, Dr. Crain, then asked Mr. Killebrew to formulate a draft policy consistent with conclusions and recommendations of the subcommittee.

February 24, 2005 - The full Council considered the first draft of the proposed policy 2.19 - Responsibilities and Requirements for the Enrollment of Students Across Multiple Institutions. Several suggestions for clarification and/or refinements were made. In addition, additional consultation with select institutions was advised for particular sections.

February-May, 2005 - Mr. Killebrew made needed changes and sent the second draft to the Subcommittee for further review. Additional small changes were made.

May 26, 2005 - The Council unanimously approved the second draft for consideration by the Board of Regents.

STAFF SUMMARY

Using the format suggested in the report of the U.S. Department of Education titled State Enrollment Policies: Addressing Access and Quality, the proposed new policy codifies statewide higher education responsibilities and requirements for the formation and implementation of agreements covering the enrollment of students across and between multiple campuses. Yet, this proposed policy is not complete, as significant financial issues (tuition and state funding) have yet to be addressed. This is not to suggest, however, that other agreed upon portions of the policy should remain in limbo until pending financial concerns have been resolved. The staff believes strongly that institutions should begin to abide by commonly accepted principles already approved, regardless of financial impact. Still, the likelihood that there will be increased opportunities for student multi-institutional enrollments is small unless there is consensus for a cost-sharing/support program.

With specific regard to financial concerns, the staff notes that the Commissioner has been working to garner specialized funding to cover expected additional costs in this fiscal year's budget. While not yet finalized, it appears that prospect for such are good. If and when needed monies become available, then discussions with and between the Governor's Office, the Legislature, the higher education management boards, the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education, and the State Department of Education will be needed to ensure a fair and equitable formula that appropriately distributes financial responsibility/support among all affected parties.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The staff recommends that the Academic and Student Affairs Committee grant approval for proposed new Academic Affairs Policy 2.19 - Responsibilities and Requirements for the Enrollment of Students Across Multiple Institutions, effective immediately. The Commissioner shall endeavor to seek appropriate financial support to assist in the full implementation of this policy and, once financial agreements have been worked out between affected parties, revisions to the policy to cover these circumstances shall be proposed by staff and considered by the Board of Regents.

APPENDIX

Academic Affairs Policy 2.19

Institutional Responsibilities for the Enrollment of Students Across Multiple Institutions

A. Purpose

Increasingly, students are more mobile in their pursuit of secondary and postsecondary education. This mobility should be encouraged and supported by state policies which assist them in the attainment of their educational goals while continuing to guarantee the quality of the experience. Within secondary settings, appropriately qualified students should be provided reasonable opportunities and mechanisms to benefit from postsecondary education and training. Within postsecondary settings, appropriately qualified students should be provided reasonable opportunities and mechanisms to take collegiate-level coursework across multiple settings.

Accordingly, both secondary and post-secondary institutions should consider enrollment procedures and accommodations between and among different types of campus settings that encourage student access, progression, and achievement through varied enrollment options. Specifically, such policies should:

1. Help students successfully transition from secondary to postsecondary education;
2. Reduce the necessity for remedial coursework;
3. Create opportunities for students to advance their educational goals more effectively and efficiently; and
4. Provide multiple and varied opportunities for educational advancement, while assuring appropriate levels of academic rigor.

The policy which follows, while referring to secondary institutions, is intended only to be binding upon public postsecondary institutions. The Board of Regents shall work with the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education to resolve any secondary institution issues which may occur as a result of this policy.

B. Definition of Terms

Before establishing parameters, it would assist all affected parties to understand the different circumstances of student multiple enrollment that this policy is designed to address:

1. **Dual Enrollment** - the simultaneous enrollment of a student at both a secondary and a post-secondary institution.
2. **Cross Enrollment** - the simultaneous enrollment of a student in more than one postsecondary institution wherein one institution serves as the student's home institution.

3. **Concurrent Enrollment** - the simultaneous enrollment of a student in more than one postsecondary institution wherein the student does not designate a home institution.

C. Institutional Responsibilities

Below are charts which define institutional responsibilities to accommodate the needs of varied multiple student enrollments as defined above.

1. Dual Enrollment

a. Student Receiving Both Secondary and Postsecondary Course Credits

ISSUE	INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
Student Admission	It is assumed that the secondary admission procedures have already been resolved. It is then incumbent upon the postsecondary institution to ensure that the student meets its admission requirements. Postsecondary institutions shall be guided by requirements of Academic Affairs Policy 2.18 - <u>Minimum Requirements for Placement into Entry-Level, College-Level Mathematics and English</u> . Each postsecondary institution shall establish appropriate age requirements as necessary.
Student Mix	Courses offered via dual enrollment may be comprised of all secondary students or a mix of both secondary and postsecondary students. Both the secondary and postsecondary institutions shall jointly agree upon the appropriate student mix.
Course Content	Both the secondary and postsecondary institutions shall jointly determine the appropriate level of course content. For postsecondary institutions, course content may not be any less than that which is required of a similar course open to postsecondary students only.

Faculty	<p>The faculty assigned to teach the dual enrollment course may be an employee either of the secondary or postsecondary institution.</p> <p>Both the secondary and postsecondary institutions shall jointly agree upon faculty appointment. Postsecondary institutions shall ensure that secondary faculty possess necessary qualifications and meet appropriate regional and program accreditation requirements for instruction. It is assumed that secondary institutions shall also ensure that postsecondary faculty possess necessary qualifications and meet appropriate accreditation requirements for instruction.</p>
Course Setting and Learning Support (Facilities, Equipment, Access to Appropriate Supporting Learning Resources, etc.)	<p>Dual enrollment courses may be offered at a secondary institutional setting, a post-secondary institutional setting, or an appropriate neutral setting. This decision shall be a mutual one of both the secondary and postsecondary institution. Both types of institutions shall jointly ensure the appropriateness of the location, access to physical facilities, access to appropriate equipment, and access to appropriate learning resources.</p>
Awarding of Course Credit	<p>Dual enrollment courses of this type shall be accepted for appropriate credit by both types of institutions. No dual enrollment course of this type may be offered without such agreement. It shall be incumbent upon both institutions to fully inform enrolled students of the type and applicability of such credit.</p>
State Oversight	<p>Postsecondary institutions shall annually report to the Board of Regents dual enrollment courses offered, where offered, the numbers of students enrolled in each, and the course credit awarded in each. It is assumed that similar requirements shall be set by the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education for secondary institutions.</p>

Tuition	
State Funding	

b. Student Receiving Postsecondary Course Credits Only

ISSUE	INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
Student Admission	The postsecondary institution shall ensure that the student meets its admission requirements. Postsecondary institutions shall be guided by requirements of Academic Affairs Policy 2.18 - <u>Minimum Requirements for Placement into Entry-Level, College-Level Mathematics and English</u> . The postsecondary institution shall establish appropriate age requirements as necessary.
Student Mix	Courses offered via dual enrollment may be comprised of all secondary students or a mix of both secondary and postsecondary students. The postsecondary institution shall make this decision.
Course Content	The postsecondary institutions shall determine the appropriate level of course content. Course content may not be any less than that which is required of a similar course open to postsecondary students only.
Faculty	The faculty assigned to teach the dual enrollment course may be an employee either of the secondary or postsecondary institution. The postsecondary institution shall decide upon faculty appointment. Postsecondary institutions shall ensure that faculty possess necessary qualifications and meet appropriate regional and program accreditation requirements for instruction.

Course Setting and Learning Support (Facilities, Equipment, Access to Appropriate Supporting Learning Resources, etc.)	Dual enrollment courses may be offered at a secondary institutional setting, a post- secondary institutional setting, or an appropriate neutral setting. This decision shall be made by the postsecondary institution. The postsecondary institution shall ensure the appropriateness of the location, access to physical facilities, access to appropriate equipment, and access to appropriate learning resources.
Awarding of Course Credit	Dual enrollment courses of this type shall be accepted for appropriate credit by the postsecondary institution. No dual enrollment course of this type may be offered otherwise. It shall be incumbent upon the postsecondary to fully inform enrolled students of the type and applicability of such credit.
State Oversight	Postsecondary institutions shall annually report to the Board of Regents dual enrollment courses offered, where offered, the numbers of students enrolled in each, and the course credit awarded in each.
Tuition	
State Funding	

2. Cross Enrollment

ISSUE	INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
-------	------------------------------

Student Admission	Both the home postsecondary institution (receiving the cross enrollment course credit) and the host postsecondary institution (offering the cross enrollment course) shall ensure that the student meet their admission requirements. Postsecondary institutions shall be guided by requirements of Academic Affairs Policy 2.18 - <u>Minimum Requirements for Placement into Entry-Level, College-Level Mathematics and English</u> . The home postsecondary institution may impose a reasonable limit as to the amount and date of completion for course credit earned at host postsecondary institutions.
Student Mix	NA
Course Content	The host postsecondary institution offering the cross enrollment course shall determine the appropriate level of course content.
Faculty	The host postsecondary institution offering the cross enrollment course shall decide upon faculty appointment. Both the home and host postsecondary institutions shall ensure that faculty possess necessary qualifications and meet appropriate regional and program accreditation requirements for instruction.
Course Setting and Learning Support (Facilities, Equipment, Access to Appropriate Supporting Learning Resources, etc.)	The host postsecondary institution offering the cross enrollment course shall decide the location of course offering. This institution shall ensure the appropriateness of the location, access to physical facilities, access to appropriate equipment, and access to appropriate learning resources.
Awarding of Course Credit	Cross enrollment courses shall be accepted for appropriate credit by both the home and host postsecondary institution. No cross enrollment course of this type may be offered otherwise. It shall be incumbent upon both postsecondary institutions to fully inform enrolled students of the type and applicability of such credit.

State Oversight	The host postsecondary institution offering the cross enrollment course shall annually report to the Board of Regents cross enrollment courses offered, where offered, the numbers of students enrolled in each, and the course credit awarded in each.
Tuition	
State Funding	

3. Concurrent Enrollment

Students simultaneously taking coursework at varied postsecondary institutions without designation of a home institution shall be governed by appropriate policies and procedures of each postsecondary institution offering courses in which they are enrolled. Postsecondary institutions shall work together to synchronize such policies and procedures to the greatest extent possible. It is incumbent upon all postsecondary institutions to eliminate undue barriers which inhibit/prohibit the applicability of credit earned across varied institutions.

D. Effective Date

This policy shall become effective for all public postsecondary institutions upon approval by the Board of Regents.

June 23, 2005

DRAFT